

Appl. No. 10/707,279
Amdt. dated July 8, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 03, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Objection to the abstract:

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of using claim language.

5

Response:

The abstract has been amended as shown in the Amendments to the Specification section above. Acceptance of the amended abstract is respectfully requested.

10

2. Objection to claim 12:

Claim 12 is objected to due to several informalities.

Response:

15

Claim 12 has been amended in order to correct these informalities. In addition, the applicant has also corrected several grammar errors in other claims. Acceptance of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

20

3. Rejection of claims 1, 3, 6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1, 3, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. (US 6,837,569) in view of Hashizume et al. (US 6,000,802).

Response:

25

Independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended to overcome this rejection. Claim 1 now contains the limitations previously found in dependent claim 2, and claim 6 now contains the limitations previously found in dependent claim 7. Claims 2 and 7 have subsequently been cancelled. Claims 2 and 7 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening

Appl. No. 10/707,279
Amdt. dated July 8, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 03, 2005

claims. Reconsideration of claims 1, 3, 6, and 8 is respectfully requested.

4. Introduction to new claims 20 and 21:

5 New claim 20 contains the limitations found in original claims 1 and 4, whereas new claim 21 contains the limitations found in original claims 6 and 9. Claims 4 and 9 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Acceptance of new claims 20 and 21 is respectfully requested.

10 5. Comments on reasons for allowance:

The applicant noticed a minor mistake in the reasons for allowance for claim 9, and would like to clarify the record of the reasons for allowance with respect to claim 9.


15 On page 4, line 13 of the Office action, the examiner states that, "...the prior art fails to show an adjusting apparatus wherein **one end of the adjusting device has at least one repositioning device...**". However, the actual limitation in claim 9 reads, "...on side surfaces of said base having at least one repositioning device...".

20 Since all pending claims in the instant application are allowable, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

25

Appl. No. 10/707,279
Amdt. dated July 8, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 03, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Date: July 8, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.